

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	-
10/604,189	06/30/2003	Michael D. Bowman	03-0431 (BOE 0406 PA)	1188	•
27256 7590 02/03/2006			EXAMINER		
ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.			PARRIES, DRU M		
28333 TELEGR	RAPH RD.				_
SUITE 250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034			2836		-

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	17
	10/604,189	BOWMAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dru M. Parries	2836	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	S
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communi D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 De	ecember 2005.		
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the mer	its is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers		•	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2003 is/are: a)	⊠ accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.1	121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-15	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stag	е
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atom / ipphoadon (F 10-102)	

Application/Control Number: 10/604,189 Page 2

Art Unit: 2836

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments, see page 6, filed December 16, 2005, with respect to the objection of claims 12-19 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of claims 12-19 has been withdrawn.
- 2. Applicant's arguments filed December 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner points out that Soucy's invention teaches a power management system for an aircraft. Also, Lacy teaches primary loads (18) that are always powered by the fuel cell system, and secondary loads (16), which are managed by the controller. Also, Lacy does determine the combined power demand of the controlled loads ("the controller...to determine the power consumed by the residential loads" - Abstract) and a power limit set on the controlled loads as a group ("provide power up to a first threshold that is less than a maximum power threshold that is capable of being consumed by the residential loads" - Abstract). The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's take that Lacy is nonanalogous art. Both inventions, Lacy and Soucy, are regarding how to manage the output power of a supply to loads (load power management), and the modification used from Lacy to be put into Soucy is how Lacy goes about managing load power to secondary loads. Therefore, in contrast to Applicant's argument, the function of Lacy that is being modified into Soucy is not clearly different (the modification being, how the distribution of power to the loads is being managed). The Examiner agrees with the Applicant's statement that limitations from the specification should not be read into the claims, therefore they won't be. The Examiner suggests that if a limitation from the

Art Unit: 2836

specification should be in the claim, that the Applicant add that limitation (in writing) to the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Page 3

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soucy (6,476,510) and Lacy (6,510,369). Soucy teaches a power management system for an aircraft. He teaches plurality of secondary loads (direct - generator, indirect - load, Fig. 1), at least one flight condition sensor (engine speed sensor), and a controller (fuel supply controller & governor) coupled to the plurality of loads and the sensor. Soucy doesn't explicitly teach how the controller will control the system to work efficiently. Lacy teaches a system with a controller and primary (uncontrolled residential) and secondary (controlled residential) loads. Lacy teaches a controller that can determine the secondary power extraction, current operating conditions and secondary power extraction limit and can operate the plurality of secondary loads in response to the secondary power extraction and limits. (Abstract, lines 7-12) The controller, while determining current operating conditions determines the primary power extraction (power output to uncontrolled residential loads). Lacy also teaches the controller operating the secondary loads in priority (Col. 5, lines 56-64). He also teaches the controller limiting the operation the secondary loads when the power extraction is greater than the limit (Col. 4, lines 1-14). (Col. 2, lines 59-67; Col. 3, lines 28-36; Col. 4, lines 32-44) It would have been obvious to one of

Application/Control Number: 10/604,189

Art Unit: 2836

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Lacy's method of power distribution into Soucy's invention so that the engine can supply power to as many loads as possible in the safest possible way, and to make sure that the engine never exceeds its output capabilities which may lead to malfunction.

#### **Conclusion**

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 8:00am to 5:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

**DMP** 

1-23-2006

ROBERT L. DEBERADINIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER